0011367

START

Meeting Minutes Transmittal/Approval
Unit Managers Special Meeting:
100-DR-1 Operable Unit Comment Resolution
450 Hills Street, Room 47, Richland, WA
July 31, 1990

Appvl.: [signature] Date: 19 Oct 90
J.D. Goodenough, 100-DR-1 Unit Manager, DOE-RL (A6-95)

Appvl.: [signature] Date 10/19/90
Larry Goldstein, 100-DR-I Unit Manager, WA Department of Ecology

Appvl.: [signature] for Date: 17 Oct 90
Douglas R. Sherwood, 100-DR-1 Unit Manager, EPA (B5-01)

Meeting Minutes are attached. Minutes are comprised of the following:
- Attachment #1 - Summary of Commitments and Agreements;
- Attachment #2 - Attendance List.

Concurrence by: [signature] Date: 10/17/90
WHC 100-DR-1 RI Coordinator

Distribution:

Chuck Cline, Ecology
Holly Delaney, Golder Associates
Larry Goldstein, Ecology
James Goodenough, DOE (A6-95)
Alan Krug, WHC (H4-55)
Merl Lauterbach, WHC (H4-55)
Jim Patterson, WHC
Doug Sherwood, EPA (B5-01)
Steve Weiss, WHC (H4-55)

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD: 100-DR-1; Care of Susan Wray, WHC (H4-51)

Attachment #1

Summary of Commitments and Agreements
Unit Managers Special Meeting
100-DR-1 Operable Unit Comment Resolution
450 Hills Street, Room 47
July 31, 1990

Section 1.0

Comment 1.6

It was agreed that specific issues which may require additional data include air pollution emissions, cooling waste treatment system and the fuel storage basins. These data will be gathered during the Phase I RFI. This will be specified in the work plan.

Comment 1.7

WHC agreed to incorporate latest guidance.

Section 2.0

Comment 2.5

There will be a generic statement included at the beginning of the first paragraph to indicate that missing information will be addressed.

Comment 2.11

It was agreed that the final flow diagram should be developed as a part of source data compilation in Part I of the RFI. This will be mentioned in the work plan.

Comment 2.12

There will be a statement included at the beginning of the work plan to address the question of spent cooling water storage time in the retention basins.

Comment 2.18

A suitable process flow diagram for the reactor system is needed. There are some uncertainties which will need to be determined by actual field inspections. The flow diagram will be developed as part of the Phase I of the RFI document.

Comment 2.19

It is agreed that there will be a subsection added on the composition of the fly ash from coal combustion and its impact. This will be incorporated into the work plan.

Comment 2.20

The information on liquid waste streams needs to be collected. This should be mentioned in the work plan. This material will be collected and included in Phase I of the RFI. Both the contaminant levels and liquid flow rates will be included in the text.

Comment 2.21

The information on hazardous chemical inventories for herbicides, pesticides and related materials will be collected during Phase I of the RFI. This will be mentioned in the text of the work plan.

Comment 2.23

Waste storage volume and inventories will be determined and reported in Phase I of the RFI. this will be mentioned in the work plan.

Comment 2.25

It is agreed that necessary information on contaminants in the cooling system and related information on Reactor D&D programs will be discussed in the work plan.

Comment 2.27

New text will be added explaining "release from radiological controls".

Comment 2.29

Figure 5 will be referenced in this section of the work plan.

Comment 2.31

The required information will be mentioned in the work plan.

Comment 2.34

The required information is a part of the Reactor D&D program, which will be mentioned in the text. The information needed will be collected as part of the D&D program.

Comment 2.37

The composition of the ash residues remaining at the site will be analyzed during Phase I of the RFI. This will be mentioned in the work plan.

Comment 2.40

The discrepancy reported in the original comment will be corrected in the text of the work plan.

Comment 2.41, 2.42

It will be stated that the UST program is collecting data in a manner so that the data can be used in the RCRA/CERCLA program, and that this data will be used by this RFI.

Comment 2.47

It will be stated that the difference in elevation of 100-DR-1 operable unit relative to Columbia River is 76 feet.

Comment 2.54

The question of the geological depositional history of the Site is relatively unknown. This matter will be the subject of further study as part of the Phase I RFI. This will be stated in the text.

Comment 2.61(A)

Figure 9 will be identified as conceptual.

Comment 2.61(B)

The definition of "matric potential" will be presented in the text.

Comment 2.63

The potentiometric information requested on groundwater levels will continue to remain in the 100-HR-3 work plan, and will be referenced in the 100-DR-1 work plan.

Comment 2.66

The stormwater runoff information requested will be investigated in Phase I of the RFI. This fact will be mentioned in the work plan.

Comment 2.71

See SAP 38.

Comment 2.72

Additional data collection will be discussed in detail in the Field Sampling Plan (FSP) of the Sampling and Analysis (SAP).

Comment 2.74

The sentence on "transient" animals will be deleted to avoid confusion.

Comment 2.75, 2.80

It was agreed that the use of "foreseeable future", and "speculative", and "the entire Hanford Site would be administratively controlled" will be omitted. This issue will be discussed in the work plan using current information from the DOE.

Comment 2.76

This matter has already been clarified.

Comment 2.81

There is a potential for the disruption of habitats of sensitive species within or immediately outside of the 100-DR-1 operable unit from remediation efforts. The specific habitats falling within this category will be identified. The trees used by the bald eagles will be a matter of specific concern. A letter will be prepared by WHC to the Washington Department of Wildlife Services to request information on the impacts of site characterization on roosting areas and other sensitive habitats.

Section 3.0

Comment 3.3

A paragraph will be added to the introduction to Section 3.0 that states that there are data gaps on known and potential contamination at the operable unit, and that Section 5 of the work plan and the FSP will address them. The specific data gaps discussed below will be identified in the work plan.

Comment 3.4

The data which is listed as missing in the attached table will be collected as part of the RFI.

Comment 3.6

See comment 1.7.

Comment 3.9

The requested data will be added to the text of the work plan.

Comment 3.10

The testing activities will be described in the Field Sampling Plan. The data gaps identified will be referenced.

Comment 3.17

The radioactivity levels in the respective waste disposal facilities will be collected and incorporated into Phase I of the RFI.

Comment 3.18

The information on inorganic waste levels will be collected at the waste disposal facilities and summarized into the former Table 24 (now Table 25).

Comment 3.26

Additional data will be collected in Phase I of the RFI to close any existing gaps in the available information.

Comment 3.32

The coal ash at the site will be sampled and analyzed. The results will be reported in Phase I of the RFI.

Comment 3.34

That there will be coordination between the several different environmental programs will be mentioned and described in the work plan, including the PCB electrical transformer facilities and the underground storage tanks.

Comment 3.53

Applicable air standards have been added to the text.

Comment 3.54

Documentation will be added to address the location-specific applicable and relevant (ARAR) standards for the site.

Comment 3.56

A statement will be provided in Section 3.3.1 to make reference to additional materials in Chapter 5, on risk assessments. A comprehensive list of the radioactive and chemical constituents will be generated with RFI because the list presented in Table 25 is incomplete. The language in this text should indicate that there is a considerable degree of uncertainty in the amount of contamination presented.

Comment 3.57

Text will be added to address the status of risk assessment/flow and transport modeling, and peer review. Those codes in Appendix A that will definitely not be used will be eliminated.

Comment 3.58

See comment 3.57.

Comment 3.63

Ecology questioned whether the toxicity discussion in Section 3.3.2.1 is really applicable, i.e., are only chrome and copper relevant. This discussion will be revised to reflect our lack of confidence and what we do and do not know. Table 25 will include known inventories of contaminants.

Comment 3.72

A statement will be added to describe how the CMS will define the preferred alternative.

Section 4.0

Comment 4.1

It was agreed that these items will reference 100-HR-3; the information will not be duplicated.

Comment 4.3

See 4.1.

Comment 4.4

It was agreed to collect additional data (i.e., total suspended solids and pH) as a part of the site specific analysis.

Comment 4.7

The soil moisture content at each lithologic break in each borehole will be measured; this will be clarified in the work plan.

Comment 4.9

See SAP.38.

Section 5.0

Comment 5.5

A reference will be provided for the PMP organization chart in Section 5.1.1 of the work plan.

Comment 5.7

The 100-DR-1 and 100-HR-3 operable units work plans will include sections in common relative to source and groundwater studies.

Comment 5.11

The use of the term "relatively" in the phrase "relatively small facilities" will be defined in the text of the work plan.

Comment 5.12

The question of possible pipeline leakage will be addressed in this section. The language will clarify that camera surveys will assist in the investigation of the pipelines, and boreholes will follow in known areas of contamination.

Comment 5.13

It was agreed that the area of wipe samples will not be "statistically valid". Statistically valid sampling cannot be done as a matter of practicality, nor is it needed for this stage of the RFI.

Comment 5.25

The response on waste minimization is acceptable in the work plan.

Comment 5.26

Additional wording will be added to the work plan to clarify the EPA guidance, which is acceptable.

Sampling and Analysis Plan

Comment SAP.1

Additional wording will be added as an Introduction to describe the purpose and the course of action for the Sampling and Analysis Plan.

EPA and Ecology will provide text describing their respective oversight roles for independent verification of data.

Comment SAP.3

The well-drilling schemes will more clearly define the points of sample collection.

Comment SAP.5

The main concern was EII 5.3, Biotic Sampling. If the EII is not completed before the work plan is approved, a substitute general procedure will be presented in the work plan.
Steve Weiss will develop this text.

Comment SAP.6

See SAP.1.

Comment SAP.7

The strategy outlined in the DQOs and the Site Characterization document will be clarified and expanded.

Comment SAP.18

A figure in the text will be referenced.

Comment SAP.19

A figure in the text will be referenced.

Comment SAP.20

The reference to percentages of the total area sampled will not be discussed as per comment 5.13.

Comment SAP.21

Table 3 has been modified to explain the choice of metals analysis.

Comment SAP.28

It is not necessary to address size as per comment 5.13.

Comment SAP.34

Response accepted and text will be revised.

Comment SAP.35

The explanation of field survey procedures and data compilation methods will be expanded and clarified.

Comment SAP.38

See SAP.5.

Quality Assurance Program Plan

Comment QAPP.1

The change requested by this comment has already been made in the text of the Quality Assurance Program Plan.

Comment QAPP.2

It was agreed to include a listing of QA procedures by subject and document as called out in the text. Procedures not yet available will be noted, and a committment made at the Unit Managers Meeting to complete.

Comment QAPP.4

The reference to "offsite" facilities will be removed from the text in Section 3.0 of the Quality Assurance Program Plan.

Comment QAPP.7

Although silica sand may have been used at the Hanford Site in the past for soil sampling field, equipment, and trip blanks, DOE and WHC do not believe that is technically defensible. EPA was in agreement with this, and Doug Sherwood agreed to look further into the matter. Until WHC receives further information, the QAPP will not be changed.

Comment QAPP.10

It was agreed that the text will not be changed.

Attachment #2

Attendance List
Unit Managers Special Meeting
100-DR-1 Operable Unit Comment Resolution
July 31, 1990

Charles Cline, Ecology	206 438-7556
Hal Cooper, Brown and Caldwell	206 281-4000
Holly Delaney, Golder Associates	206 883-0777
Larry Goldstein, Ecology	206 438-7018
James Goodenough, DOE	509 376-7087
Robin Grant, Brown and Caldwell	206 281-4000
Alan Krug, WHC	509 376-5634
Merl Lauterbach, WHC	509 376-5257
David Murray, Brown and Caldwell	503 244-7005
Douglas Sherwood, EPA	509 376-9529
Stephen Weiss, WHC	509 376-1683